

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

**DIVISION TWO**

In re Y.A. et al., Persons Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY DEPARTMENT  
OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

T.A.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E035115

(Super.Ct.No. SWJ1102)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Robert W. Nagby,  
Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21.) Affirmed.

Lisa A. DiGrazia, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and  
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

No appearance for Minors.

T.A. (father), the father of Y.A. (who is presently 18 years old) and S.A. (who is presently 16 years old), appeals from a dispositional order entered after the trial court sustained a supplemental petition. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 387.)<sup>1</sup>

On November 25, 2002, the Riverside Department of Public Social Services, filed petitions pursuant to section 300, subdivisions (b), (d) and (j) alleging that the girls had been sexually molested by their father and that their mother, who is not a party to this appeal, failed to protect them. Sibling petitions were filed on behalf of two younger brothers who were not molested.

A contested jurisdiction hearing was held on January 7, 2003. The court sustained the petition as to all four children. The two girls were removed from the custody of both parents. The two boys were placed in the custody of their mother. Y.A. was eventually placed with the maternal grandmother

At the six-month review hearing (§ 366.21, subd. (e)) held on August 19, 2003, the dependency as to the two boys was dismissed, and the two girls were returned to the family home with the court ordering family maintenance services.

On October 24, 2003, a supplemental petition was filed on behalf of both girls alleging that father had asked Y.A. to orally copulate him, that father had been left alone with the children and that the parents did not want her to return to the family home.

At the contested hearing on the supplemental petition, Y.A. testified that she had actually orally copulated her father. Father swore on the Koran that she had not. Despite

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to this code.

having her credibility attacked in a number of ways, the court found her credible and sustained the petition. At the dispositional hearing, custody of the two girls was removed from the parents.

Father has appealed from the dispositional order, and at his request we appointed counsel for him. Counsel has filed a no issue brief under authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738. It sets forth a statement of the case, a statement of facts and potential issues on appeal, and it asks us to conduct an independent review of the entire record.

At our invitation, father had filed a personal supplemental brief which we have read and considered.

We have now completed our independent review and find no arguable issues.

The judgment is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

/s/ McKinster  
J.

We concur:

/s/ Hollenhorst  
Acting P.J.  
/s/ Ward  
J.